

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

01 November 2016

Version of attached file:

Published Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Clements, Rebekah (2014) 'Cross-dressing as Lady Murasaki – concepts of vernacular translation in early modern Japan.', *Testo a fronte.*, 51 . pp. 29-51.

Further information on publisher's website:

<http://www.marcosymarcos.com/libri/testo-a-fronte-51/>

Publisher's copyright statement:

Additional information:

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

CROSS-DRESSING AS LADY MURASAKI – CONCEPTS
OF VERNACULAR TRANSLATION IN EARLY MODERN JAPAN

Recent studies have yielded insights into how *Genji monogatari* was received and transmitted in Japan during the Tokugawa or early-modern period (1603-1868). However, the role of translation has not been explored in much detail since 1932, when Fujita Tokutarō collated a list of what he called *Genji* “translations and adaptations” (*yakubun hon'an*).¹ With some exceptions, most of these may be described as “vernacular translations”. That is, they attempt to transfer the story and elite literary language of *Genji* (in whole or in part) into a narrative that employed readable, up-to-date, and widely-used forms of Tokugawa written language. There were many translations of *Genji* during the period, including but not limited to the works on Fujita’s list. The methodology varies greatly, and includes abridged translations such as digests, longer versions modelled stylistically on contemporary fiction, and works that attempted a lengthy, linguistically-accurate vernacular reflection of the text. The vernacular *Genjis* are part of a much wider phenomenon of the reception of Heian (794-1185) and Kamakura (1185-1333) texts during the early-modern period that also saw printed editions, commentaries, illustration, pastiche and parody, and which is increasingly an object of study.² Though the vernacular translations of *Genji* are not entirely unknown to scholarship, many of them are unavailable in modern reprint, and the majority are yet to be studied in detail.

Some important questions that remain unanswered concern the ways vernacular translations were thought of in their day, and why translation was adopted as a strategy. As a step towards answering these, this article examines the terminology and metaphors translators used to describe their work.³ Though they used a variety of terms to denote translation, it was largely through metaphor and literary allusion that the early-modern translators of Heian and Kamakura literature expressed their opinions. Even *Shibun ama no saezuri* (Murasaki’s Writings in the Gibberish of Fisherfolk, 1723) that contains extensive prefatory remarks about the project, clothes the notion of translation in metaphor. Likewise, Motoori Norinaga (1730-1801) in his famous vernacular translation of the *Kokin wakashū* (Collection of Poems, Ancient and Modern, ca. 905), resorted to the image of a telescope to explain the act of translation.⁴ It is thus to such metaphors, found in prefaces and the titles of works, that scholars must turn. Though prefaces often contain conventional platitudes, and in some cases facetious wit, a cautious examination reveals common themes that paint a clearer picture of vernacular translation in *Genji* reception history. In particular, it is possible to observe a change over

time as translators exhibited a growing confidence in the value of vernacular translation.

The Boundaries of "Translation"

Translation studies scholars have noted that terminology and paradigms from one intellectual tradition do not usually map neatly onto another, and so it is necessary to outline what is meant here by "translation".⁵ The term has a spectrum of meaning, ranging from what Theo Hermans described as "a transcendental and utopian conception of translation as reproducing the original, the whole original and nothing but the original", to George Steiner's claim that every act of linguistic understanding may be regarded as an act of translation.⁶ Recent work in translation studies has expanded "translation" to include various types of what André Lefevre termed "rewritings" or "refractions" of a text.⁷

Such variety challenges historians hoping that the boundaries of their study will lie within practical limits. A particular difficulty lies in the understandable reluctance to distinguish between "translation" and other forms of rewriting such as "adaptation".⁸ In practice, each historian of translation draws his or her own boundaries.⁹ Though it is important to acknowledge the closeness of different forms of "rewriting" and intertextuality in the history of *Genji* reception, particularly those described variously as digest, adaptation, pastiche, parody, and translation, here I focus on those neglected works which do not greatly alter the storyline of *Genji* and in which the transfer of content into the new text takes place by exchanging Heian Japanese for written forms of Tokugawa vernacular language.¹⁰

I describe such language provisionally as "vernacular" in the sense that it was particular to the people of eighteenth-and-nineteenth century Japan, but also in so far as the registers of the translations contained much that was informal or even colloquial when compared with the courtly language of the source(s). Since Heian and Tokugawa forms of Japanese are related they may interpenetrate the same page, and traces of the courtly source language could be retained to varying degrees mixed with Tokugawa vernacular vocabularies and usages.¹¹ Indeed, such hybridization was part of the way in which Tokugawa written language developed during the period. The translators themselves often described their work by reference to the vernacular elements, calling their choice of language "*zokugo*", meaning "everyday", "informal" or even "vulgar" language. During the period, *zoku* was contrasted with *ga* – the elegant, courtly or old-fashioned – and the language of *Genji* could be placed in this latter category when juxtaposed with developing forms of Tokugawa written or spoken language.¹²

The present study is, moreover, limited to translations that involved a length-

ier reproduction of the source text(s) of *Genji* than works known as "digests". Though digests are an early form of *Genji* translation, their methodology involved considerably more abbreviation than the works examined here. Moreover, there seems to have been a conceptual distinction made during the period. The writers of digests, if they described their project at all, tended to do so with an emphasis on abbreviation. For the most part, they use different terminology and metaphors from those found in the translations examined here, which, as we will see, draw on images of transfer, cross-dressing, exile and erotic substitution.¹³

Early-modern Translations of *Genji*

Since the translations that are the subject of this article are not widely studied today, it may be helpful to sketch some background details. They were produced at a time of unprecedented access, not only to *Genji* but to other works of the Heian court in various forms by readers beyond the aristocratic, monastic, and high-ranking warrior circles where such texts had circulated in the past.¹⁴ A major scholastic and literary shift took place together with the advent of a commercial printing industry as new classes of readers emerged, particularly those belonging to the merchant class and lower-ranking samurai. In the case of *Genji*, the seventeenth century saw numerous woodblock print editions published for the first time.¹⁵ The most widely circulated of these was the version contained in the *Kogetsushō* (Moon on the Lake Commentary, 1673), and it is likely that this is the edition upon which many of the translations gathered here were based.¹⁶ Following the new printed editions, a variety of strategies for accessing *Genji* sprang up, or appeared in print for the first time, including commentaries, digests, illustrated editions and vernacular translations.¹⁷

Other texts from the Heian and Kamakura periods that were subjected to a range of interpretive strategies included works of poetry such as *Ise monogatari* (Tales of Ise, ca. 900), *Kokin wakashū*, and *Hyakunin isshu* (One Hundred Poets, One Poem Each, ca. 1235).¹⁸ These strategies included vernacular translation: *Ise* was translated using a blend of classical Japanese and formal Genroku prose by Ki no Zankei (dates unknown) in 1678 and illustrated by Hishikawa Moronobu (1618-1694).¹⁹ *Kokinshū* was first translated using elements from colloquial spoken Japanese by the influential Kokugaku scholar Motoori Norinaga and then controversially by Ozaki Masayoshi (1755-1827), who was accused of copying Norinaga.²⁰ *Hyakunin isshu* was likewise subject to translation as Norinaga's followers produced a series of commentaries that included colloquial renderings of the poems.²¹

Following digest versions which began to be printed in the seventeenth century, the longer *Genji* translations began in the early seventeenth-century and

were produced well into the nineteenth. Figure 1, which is based on Fujita's list (long out of print) with some amendments, gives details of those known to scholarship. Of these, three exist only in manuscript and seven were published in print. Most were partial translations of the early chapters. However there were three attempts to translate *Genji* in full: *Shibun ama no saezuri*, a translation as far as "Yadorigi" that is incomplete due to the death of the translator; *Kogetsushō genkai* (A Vernacular Interpretation of the Moon on the Lake Commentary, ca. 1811-1812) by an unknown translator, which is missing some chapters but may have been complete; and *Genji monogatari shizu no odamaki* (A Hempen Hand Skein for the Tale of Genji, ca. 1848), which likewise seems to have been complete but the longest extant manuscript edition is now missing some volumes.

Figure 1 – Early-modern vernacular translations of *Genji*

Title	Translator	Contents	Manuscript	Print
<i>Fūryū Genji monogatari</i> ²²	Shishido Kōfū	"Kiritsubo" – "Hahakigi" (Rainy night's discussion)		1703
<i>Wakakusa Genji monogatari</i> ²³	Okumura Masanobu	"Hahakigi" – "Yūgao" (after Rainy night's discussion)		1707
<i>Hinazuru Genji monogatari</i> ²⁴	Okumura Masanobu	"Wakamurasaki" – "Suetsumuhana"		1708
<i>Kōhaku Genji monogatari</i> ²⁵	Okumura Masanobu	"Momiji no ga" "Hana no en"		1709
<i>Zokuge Genji monogatari</i> ²⁶	Okumura Masanobu	"Kiritsubo" "Hahakigi" (Rainy night's discussion)		1710
<i>Shibun ama no saezuri</i> ²⁷	Taga Hanshichi	Manuscript: "Kiritsubo" "Yadorigi"; Print: Kiritsubo (Utsusemi)	Undated	1723
<i>Kogetsushō genkai</i> ²⁸	Unknown	"Kiritsubo" "Yume no ukihashi"	1811-1812?	
<i>Genji tōkagami</i> ²⁹	Kurita Naomasa	"Wakamurasaki"		1840
<i>Genji monogatari shizu no odamaki</i> ³⁰	Kuwahara Yukinori	"Kiritsubo" – "Yume no ukihashi"	1848	
<i>Genji hinakotoba</i> ³¹	Usuki Umehiko	"Kiritsubo"	1851	

Terms for Translation

Before examining the literary imagery the translators used to describe translation, it is helpful to examine the different words they used to label their project. Though these texts may be grouped on the basis of the working definition of translation detailed above, an examination of this language shows that such classification is not incongruent with the way the translators themselves described their work, and that common threads unite them.

Figure 2 – Terms for "translation" in early-modern translations of *Genji*³²

Text	Word(s) for intralingual translation	Transliteration	English translation
<i>Fūryū Genji monogatari</i>	筆をかみやわらげて 口をやはらげ 当世の枕詞にうつす	<i>hitsu o kamiyawaragete kuchi o yawarage tōsei no makurakotoba ni utsusu</i>	"chewing up and softening the writing brush" "softening the speech" "transferring into the pillow words of the present day"
<i>Wakakusa Genji monogatari</i>	今の世の… 言葉に写して いまの世のはやりことばにうつし	<i>ima no yo no... kotoba ni utsushite ima no yo no hayari kotoba ni utsushi</i>	"copying into the... words of the present day" "transferring into the popular words of the present day"
<i>Hinazuru Genji monogatari</i>	俗語に移せる	<i>zokugo ni utsuseru</i>	"transferring into vulgar language"
<i>Kōhaku Genji monogatari</i>	移	<i>utsuru</i>	"to transfer" (intrans)
<i>Zokuge Genji monogatari</i>	俗解	<i>zokuge</i>	"vulgar interpretation"
<i>Shibun ama no saezuri</i>	俗語をもつて引きなをしたる 俗語をもつて本文の詞を解し 俗解 俗語を添て其意をたし 通俗訳語	<i>zokugo o motte hikinaoshitaru zokugo o motte honmon no kotoba o geshi zokuge zokugo o soete sono i o tashi tsūzoku yakugo</i>	"to redo by using vulgar language" "to interpret the words of the original using vulgar language" "vulgar interpretation" "to add vulgar language and increase the meaning" "vernacularized and translated language"

Kogetsushō genkai	諺解	genkai	"vulgar interpretation"
Genji tōkagami	訳	yaku	"translation"
	通俗にかきなほし うつし	tsūzoku ni kakinaoshi utsushi	"rewriting into the everyday" "transfer/reflection"
Genji monogatari shizu no odamaki	解釈 俗語に翻	kaishaku zokugo ni hirugaesu	"interpretation" "to flip over into vulgar language"
Genji hinakotoba	大むねを今ノ世のさと びことばにうつして	ōmune o ima no yo no satobi kotoba ni utushite	"to transfer the gist into the unrefined language of the present day"

Unlike the *gendaigoyaku* ("modern-language translations") of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, in early-modern Japan there was not yet a clear category to which such texts belonged, and there is no one term that appears in all these works. However, much of the language the translators used is steeped in similar images of transfer (such as *utsusu* or *hikinaosu*) or simplification (*yawarage*, *geshi*) – often translators used both kinds of terminology.

There is, moreover, a term that was most common from the seventeenth until the mid-nineteenth century: *utsusu*, written either in hiragana, or with one of two *kanji* (写 meaning to copy a manuscript or a picture, or 移 meaning to transfer). *Utsusu* can also mean to reflect (written as 映す), and as we will see the idea of reflection appears in the imagery used to describe what a translation is in the prefaces to certain of the works examined below. *Utsusu* appears in *Fūryū Genji*, *Wakakusa Genji*, *Hinazuru Genji*, *Kōhaku Genji*, *Genji tōkagami* and *Genji hinakotoba*. Though the author of *Shibun ama no saezuri* avoids the word, perhaps to distinguish his style of translation from those which came before, the term was later used to describe the methodology of this text by the author of the *Gunsho ichiran* (Bibliographic List of Works, 1802).³³ *Utsusu* was also used in at least one other vernacular translation of a Heian text: Motoori Norinaga's translation of the *Kokinshū*.³⁴

The use of the word *utsusu*, with its various connotations, shows how translation between the languages of past and present was described as redoing, copying and transferring of content. It also has a similar etymology to that of the English word "translation", which comes from the Latin *transferre*, "to transfer".³⁵ *Utsusu* is a common thread linking works as diverse as *Fūryū Genji*

of the early seventeenth century, which keeps the storyline but contains many extra details inserted by the translator, with *Shinpen shishi* (A New Version of Murasaki's Tale, 1888-1904) of the modern period in which the translator has aimed for a higher degree of linguistic accuracy, since the methodology of *Shinpen shishi* was referred to as *utsusu* in its first preface.³⁶ For the purposes of this article I am interested in how *utsusu* works as a conceptual thread linking many of the translations, but it may be revealing in future to examine the use of this term in other forms of Tokugawa literary production as well.

Metaphors for Translation

The first text examined here, *Fūryū Genji monogatari* (1703), is rich in imagery describing translation. By commercial author Shishido Kōfū (b. 1675) writing under the pen name Miyako no Nishiki (Brocade from the Capital), *Fūryū Genji* is a retelling of the "Kiritsubo" and "Hahakigi" chapters that sits on the problematic borderline between translation and other kinds of rewriting.³⁷ Classified by modern scholars variously as a vernacular translation (*zokugo yaku*), a parody, and a work of fiction belonging to the genre now known as *ukiyo-zōshi* (books of the floating world), *Fūryū Genji* contains interpolations such as background information, interlinear commentary, erotic puns, and imagined scenes. Nonetheless it follows the storyline of *Genji* in broad outline and involves word for word translation in addition to the authorial insertions.³⁸ Though *Fūryū Genji* is considered here in the context of translation, the work is multivalent and need not be divorced from its links to the other categories of text in which it has been placed.

The first image used by Miyako no Nishiki acknowledges the difficulty of his task. *Fūryū Genji* is an attempt to "reflect the light of the vast sky in a bucket of water" (*ōzora no hikari o tarai no mizu ni utsusu ni hitoshiku*), as impudent as "trying to move Mt Ishiyama with the tip of a writing brush" (*unoke no saki de Ishiyama o ugokasan to wa aa ryōgaisenban*).³⁹ This is one point at which it becomes clear these translations, though different in methodology, are nonetheless related to some of the digests: Miyako no Nishiki's choice of image is reminiscent of the title of *Genji kokagami* (A Little Mirror of the Tale of Genji, ca. 14th century) through the idea of a small-scale reflection. However, though the words "reflect" and "transfer" are homonyms in Japanese, this translator did not use the character for "reflection" (映) but rather for transfer (移), through the pun adding an extra layer of meaning to the image.

Indeed, the idea of translation as an inferior method of replication continues but it comes to mean something more. In the introduction to the "Hahakigi" chapter, Miyako no Nishiki describes his work as the reincarnation of the cat belonging to Genji's wife, the Third Princess (Onna Sannomiya):

Miyako no Nishiki wa Onna Sannomiya ni kawayugarareshi neko no umarekawari to warainagara nezumi no hige o soenu.

Miyako no Nishiki adds his brush [strokes] laughing that it is the reincarnation of the cat doted on by Onna Sannomiya.⁴⁰

The idea of reincarnation means Miyako ni Nishiki's work is a contemporary version of part of the original *Genji*. His project, and perhaps he himself, is simply the little animal with which the Princess – here suggestive of the looming, aristocratic presence of the source text (and perhaps also of a female readership) – amuses herself from time to time, suggesting his translation is small and inferior in comparison with *Genji*, a toy with which to amuse oneself.

36 However, there is more to Miyako no Nishiki's use of feline imagery than meets the eye – translation is in fact a potentially dangerous means by which a great text may be possessed by someone to whom it does not belong. In the famous scene in *Genji*, Kashiwagi catches a forbidden glimpse of the Princess as her cat – “not quite tame yet” – darts from beneath the blinds of her salon, and because of this he conceives the obsessive passion that will eventually lead to both their downfalls. He wants the cat as a substitute for the woman he desires: “with its delicious smell and its dear little mew it felt to him naughtily enough like its mistress herself”.⁴¹ After much scheming he eventually takes it for his own and is delighted to find its meow (*nyon nyon*) sounds to him like “let's go to bed!” (*nen nen*).⁴² *Fūryū Genji* is rich with openly bawdy word play – Noguchi called it “pornographic”⁴³ – and elsewhere in the preface Miyako no Nishiki compares the reading of *Genji* to the undressing of its authoress, so it is not difficult to grasp the continuation of this theme here with the translator's choice of imagery from *Genji*: a badly-behaved “pussy”-substitute.⁴⁴ The choice of a sexualized metaphor is also consistent with what Screech has called the “sexualization of *Genji*” and the “*Genji*ization of sex”⁴⁵ and with the appropriation of *Genji* by the world of the pleasure quarters.⁴⁶ Thus in Miyako no Nishiki's eroticised schema, the Third Princess stands for the Tale, and he and his work are a naughty surrogate that readers may enjoy in place of the original, the implication being that, like Kashiwagi, they lack access to the real thing. In the preface Miyako no Nishiki argues this is because *Genji* commentaries are too difficult for many to understand.⁴⁷ Translation thus is associated with adulterous carnal knowledge, illicit glimpses of an out-of-reach original, and the replacement of that original with an inferior substitute.

These same themes of sex and substitution continue in *Wakakusa Genji monogatari* (1707). Under the pen name Baiō (“Old Man Plum”), the illustrator Okumura Masanobu (1686-1764) began his translation where *Fūryū Genji* ended, translating from the end of “Hahakigi” through to “Hana no en” in a series of three publications, 1707-1709. In a fourth work, with a preface dated

1710, he eventually returned to the beginning of the Tale and redid “Kiritsubo” and the beginning of “Hahakigi”, which had been covered by *Fūryū Genji*. Masanobu was critical of Miyako no Nishiki's methods, describing them as “shocking” (*omoigakenu*), though he acknowledged that Miyako no Nishiki “followed the original in broad outline” (*aramashi honmon ni yoru to iedomo*).⁴⁸ With the exception of some anachronistic details, often when setting the scene at the beginning of his translations, Masanobu's work contains fewer authorial insertions, and follows not only the storyline of *Genji* but in places the exact wording of the edition contained in *Kogetsushō*.⁴⁹

Masanobu claimed his translations were for the benefit of readers who have no interest in wading through commentary.⁵⁰ He also claimed to have begun the project at the request of his “little daughter(s)” (*chiisaki musume*) who had read *Fūryū Genji*, a nod to the convention of stating one's work was only for women and children.⁵¹ As with many other works prefaced in this manner, in practice the Masanobu *Genji*s were probably read by a variety of readers including samurai and educated merchants.⁵² They were still available in the nineteenth century and were found, together with *Fūryū Genji* and *Shibun ama no saezuri*, in the catalogue of the Daisō Lending library of Nagoya when it was dissolved in 1899.⁵³ Of the four works in the Masanobu series, *Wakakusa Genji monogatari* contains the most detailed prefaces. The author of the first (perhaps Masanobu himself), writes that *Wakakusa Genji*:

Mukashi no yone no fude no ato o ima no yo no murasakibōshi no iro o fukumeru kotoba ni utsushite...

...takes the impressions left by the brush of that beauty of olden times and re-writes them in the erotic language of a present-day, cross-dressing Murasaki...⁵⁴

A more literal rendering of the expression behind “cross-dressing Murasaki” is a “purple hat”. The *murasaki bōshi* was a cloth of that colour worn by female impersonators in kabuki to cover their forelocks, as well as a synecdochic reference to the young, cross-dressing men who wore *murasaki bōshi*. Used here, the expression is a pun on Murasaki Shikibu's name, and refers to the fact that, with his translation, the man Masanobu is performing an up-to-date impression of Murasaki Shikibu the female author.⁵⁵ The act of translation is treated positively, as the creation of a sexy, up-to-date version. The preface author continues:

ne ni kayoikeru nobe no wakakusa to iu kokoro ni ya, mottomo moteasobubeki mono nari.

Could it be that [by the title, *wakakusa*, “young sprout”] he means the “young sprout of the fields which shares the same root...”? It is certainly something you can play with as you like.⁵⁶

When the allusions here are unravelled they reveal an attitude to translation that is strikingly similar to Miyako no Nishiki, suggesting this is more than a throw-away line. The preface author hints that the title refers to a poem in the “Wakamurasaki” chapter of *Genji*, from which the chapter and the famous character, Murasaki, derive their names. Genji composes the poem in question when he has glimpsed the young Murasaki, who is the niece and startling likeness of Fujitsubo, the woman he desires but cannot have. Thus the imagery of the *Wakakusa Genji* preface, like Miyako no Nishiki’s cat, draws on a famous scene in *Genji* that is associated with forbidden glimpses, sexual longing, and substitution. Here is Genji’s poem:

*Te ni tsumite / itsushikamo mimu / murasaki no ne ni / kayoikeru / nobe no wakakusa.*⁵⁷

How glad I would be to pick and soon to make mine that young sprout of the fields
sprung up from the very root shared by the *murasaki*.⁵⁸

In *Genji*’s poem the girl Murasaki is the “young sprout” springing from the same root as *Genji*’s beloved Fujitsubo, who is linked to the *murasaki* plant because *fuji* and *murasaki* are both shades of purple. By alluding to this poem, the *Wakakusa* preface suggests that Masanobu’s translation springs from the same root as *Genji*, Murasaki Shikibu, just as young Murasaki springs from the same family stock as Fujitsubo. The young Murasaki, is, moreover, for *Genji* “something you can play with as you like” (the preface author’s *moteasobubeki mono*) just as readers may make the translation their own and read it as they please. The analogy is even more obvious because *moteasobu* was one of the expressions used to denote women’s leisure reading during the period.⁵⁹

Like Kashiwagi, *Genji* has an affair with the object of his affections, but in both scenarios it is the substitute with whom they spend the most time. Likewise, these translators seem to imply, readers of *Fūryū* and *Wakakusa Genji* will never fully make *Genji monogatari* their own, but may content themselves with a substitute. However, in the same way that he criticised Miyako no Nishiki’s methods, Masanobu’s choice of image suggests the superiority of his own translation, since the young Murasaki is a far more important figure than the cat and eventually comes to rival (and arguably replace) her aunt Fujitsubo in *Genji*’s affections. Despite the hopes expressed in the preface that readers might be moved to investigate the original *Genji*, the implication is that Masanobu’s translation is a serious rival that will come to replace it in their affections.⁶⁰

There are no erotic metaphors found in the next *Genji* vernacularisation to appear in print, *Shibun ama no saezuri* of 1723. Indeed, the translator says he has avoided “the popular slang of the pleasure quarters” (*yūri fukaku no hayarikotoba*).⁶¹ He was the Kōshū Domain samurai Taga Hanshichi (dates un-

known), who wrote for the benefit, he claimed, of those of “low rank” (*shimotsu kata no hito*).⁶² Although, like Miyako no Nishiki and Masanobu before him, Hanshichi also claimed his work functioned as a form of commentary for readers with low levels of literacy, from the translation itself and the detailed notes that preface the work, it is clear that Hanshichi’s approach differs to the previous two translators, and his translation aims for a closer linguistic rendering of the source with a minimum of incongruous insertions.⁶³ The translation is divided into sections labelled so as to direct the reader to the corresponding part of *Genji*.⁶⁴ *Shibun ama no saezuri* has much in common with modern Japanese translations of the twentieth century, though predating them by nearly two hundred years. Like these later versions, Hanshichi attempted to translate the text of *Genji* in full, though the manuscript edition records that he fell ill and died before he could finish. *Shibun ama no saezuri* was classified by the *Gunsho ichiran* bibliography as belonging with *Genji* commentaries (there was no separate category for “translation” in this work), and was known and read well into the nineteenth century.⁶⁵ The prominent philologist and *kokugaku* scholar Suzuki Akira (1764–1837), for one, was aware of it and in the 1830’s oversaw a translation of the “Wakamurasaki” chapter as a continuation of Hanshichi’s project.⁶⁶

As evidenced by the lengthy preface and explanatory notes (an entire volume of the woodblock print edition), Hanshichi devoted considerable time to the question of whether one should even translate *Genji* into vernacular language at all. He wrote:

shikaruyue, kotogotoku zokugo o hiroiatsume, sono buntsuzuki mo hisen naru o sen ni mochii, katsu daigō o mo, shibun ama no saezuri to nazuketari.

...because I have gathered together words from the vulgar language and the phrasing is lower-class, I have given it the title Murasaki’s Writings in the Gibberish of Fisher-folk.⁶⁷

According to this preface, the title of the translation comes from the scene in the “Akashi” chapter where the exiled *Genji* overhears the “strange gibberish of the humble fisherfolk” (*ayashiki ama domo nado no saezuri*).⁶⁸ The image of the elegant *Genji* enduring exile in coarse and countrified surroundings that recurs throughout the “Suma” and “Akashi” chapters and the distress he feels at this are powerful metaphors which underlie the translator’s view of how some might view the way he treated *Genji* by forcefully “bringing it into the vulgar language” (*zokugo ni hikinaoshite*) for a “low-ranking” (*shimotsu kata*) audience.⁶⁹

In addition to the low rank implied by the expression *amadomo*, which may be translated as “fisherfolk”, the implied audience may also be a female one.

Amadomo refers to the general class of male or female people who make their living by fishing (*ama* + *domo* a plural marker), but in Japanese literature often meant the female divers who fished for abalone (*ama* + *domo* plural marker) and who were widely romanticised in classical poetry. In other words, though the character he uses for *ama* in the title of his work (鰐) could refer to either meaning, Hanshichi is probably hinting at a female readership.⁷⁰

The work's forward, written under the penname Chōsuishi, responds to potential concerns at making *Genji* available to a low-ranking (possibly female) audience. Hanshichi's efforts and his readers enjoyment of the text are compared to "mountain rustics who make their home among the cherry blossoms" (*hana ni tatazumu yamagatsu*).⁷¹ This poetic reference suggests even more unrefined persons of low rank may enjoy something closely associated with court aesthetics like cherry blossoms.⁷² Even more significantly, Hanshichi devotes four and a half folios of the woodblock print edition to defending *Genji* from the charge that its morals would corrupt. At the time such concerns were usually aimed at female readers belonging to the commoner classes.⁷³

Hanshichi's use of self-deprecating imagery to describe this translation continues:

Ifuku ni kehare no sabetsu no aru ga gotoshi, sono waka renhai ni torimochuyuru tokoro no kotoba wa, sunawachi honmon nite haregi nari, konosho wa tada yogore shiotarete tsugihagiatetaru uchigi nari.

Just as with clothes there is a difference between everyday wear and special occasions, the original contains words which are used in *waka*, *renga* and *haikai* and so is Sunday best, whereas this book is a tear-soaked, patched-up everyday robe.⁷⁴

Just like Masanobu's cross-dressing Murasaki, the donning of a different linguistic register or language is here compared to clothing. For Masanobu and his fashionably up-to-date rendering, the overtones were positive, however in Hanshichi's case the comparison between source and target text is unfavourable. Anxiety at bringing an elite text into the vernacular language of low-born readers is found throughout the history of vernacular translation worldwide.⁷⁵ Moreover, this quote shows that in addition, for this translator, the rendering of the poetic language of *Genji* into everyday prose also contributed to the translation's inferior status.

There is no such anxiety in the next metaphor for the act of translation that appears in a vernacular *Genji*: *Genji tōkagami* of 1842, a translation of the "Wakamurasaki" chapter. More than a hundred years had passed since *Shibun ama no saezuri*, and in the meantime, translation had been elevated by Motoori Norinaga to an act of up-to-date, technical precision in his *Kokinshū tōkagami* of 1797. Kurita Naomasa (1807-1891), the author of *Genji tōkagami*, was a dis-

ciple of Suzuki Akira. According to the preliminary remarks to the work, *Genji tōkagami* was translated as a continuation of the printed edition of *Shibun ama no saezuri* which ended at the "Utsusemi" chapter.⁷⁶ Akira had apparently wished to translate *Genji* himself, but was too busy and the task fell to Naomasa; however, Akira participated closely in the translation, as evidenced by his detailed corrections to an extant draft.⁷⁷ The preliminary remarks also state that the translation method followed Norinaga's example, and this is supported by the format of the work, which, like *Kokinshū tōkagami*, gives the source text in *hiragana/kanji* followed by a vernacular translation in *katakana/kanji*.

The preface to the printed edition of *Genji tōkagami* begins with a reference to Norinaga's methodology:

Agaritaru yo no miyabigoto o ima no yo no satobigoto mochite satosu wa tōkeki atari o me no mae ni utsushi miru tōkagami to iu mono ni kayoite.

To make clear the elegant language of a long-ago world by means of unrefined language from the present one is akin to using a telescope to bring a far-off scene before the eyes.⁷⁸

Naomasa uses the same choice of imagery as Norinaga, who had begun his preface with the following poem likening the effect of vernacular translation to using a telescope to see leaves on a distant mountain:

*Kumo no iru tōki kozue mo tōkagami / utsuseba koko ni mine no momijiba.*⁷⁹

Wrapt in cloud, the treetops, and far away; yet look into the telescope, and lo: autumn leaves on the mountain peak.⁸⁰

Naomasa's opening lines are linked to Norinaga's imagery by means of the telescope metaphor and also the expression *agaritaru yo*. *Agaritaru yo* means "the world of the past" but since there is *nō* furigana in this preface, it could also be read *akaritaru yo* ("a crimson-hued world"), thus recalling the autumnal colours of the leaves in Norinaga's schema. Norinaga, for whom vernacular translation was a tool of exegesis, used the telescopic metaphor to explain why vernacular translation was needed even though there were already numerous commentaries. Reading a commentary, he argued, was like trying to find out about the trees on a far away mountain by asking one of the locals to describe them – it could never compare to seeing them with one's own eyes.

For Norinaga, vernacular translation was far superior to such a method:

Nowadays, however, there exists a device called, if I am not mistaken, the "telescope" [遠めがね]: look through this, and no matter how distant the trees, one sees them

with astonishing clarity, as if they had moved to the very spot where one stands...This present rendition of the rich crimsons of the words of a distant past into the more familiar hand-dyed hues of recent years might well be likened to the use of this glass [めかえぬ].⁸¹

Norinaga's idea of a projected image is similar to the metaphor of reflecting the sky in water that was used by Miyako no Nishiki to describe his own work, and involves the same word, *utsusu*. The difference is that Miyako no Nishiki's image is reflected poorly in a bucket, whereas in Norinaga's schema, the target and source texts are on an equal footing; in fact, they appear identical. This is what has been described by Venuti as the idea of "transparent translation", suggesting a straightforward linguistic transfer in which the source and translated texts are equally authoritative and equally able to express the ideas in the source text. Norinaga is boldly suggesting something similar in his use of the telescope metaphor in which the mountain scene and its telescopic projection appear to be the same.

The last early-modern *Genji* translation that contains material which addressed the nature of vernacular translation is *Genji monogatari shizu no odamaki* (A Hempen Hand Skein for the Tale of Genji), which was translated by the Sendai domain medic Kuwahara Yukinori (b. 1777) around 1848.⁸² *Shizu no odamaki* was possibly the first ever translation to cover all the chapters of *Genji monogatari* without major abridgement. It does not follow the exact wording of the source/s to the extent found in *Shibun ama no saezuri* and includes the occasional explanation (such as the conventional names for characters like the Kiritsubo Intimate), but is nonetheless an attempt to reflect the story of *Genji* and also to a large extent the language in a vernacular medium.⁸³ It exists only in manuscript copies, one of which is in a format that suggests it was being prepared for publication in print.⁸⁴ However, no known printed copies survive and perhaps like Hanshichi before him, Yukinori, who made the translation in old age, died before the project was completed.⁸⁵

Since the most complete extant manuscript is not the final edition and the prefatory remarks are short, it must be with reservation that conclusions are drawn about Yukinori's description of vernacular translation. However, the title of the work offers several important clues. *Shizu no odamaki* is a skein used in weaving hempen cloth.⁸⁶ There is an extra layer of meaning as the expression could also be translated as "a humble columbine", since *shizu* also means "poor" or "humble" and *odamaki* is also the name of the fan columbine plant (*Aquilebia flabellata*). The fan columbine has purple petals, which links the flower to the purple of Murasaki Shikibu's name and so to her text. Combined with the fact that, in Japanese poetry, *shizu* was associated with people from the peasant, artisan or merchant class, the implication is that the work is intended for such readers.⁸⁷ In his preface Yukinori includes the usual hope that

"women, children and the like" (*jijo nado*) will read *Shizu no odamaki*, it may mean he had women of these classes in mind, though in reality his potential readership included men as well.

Like the previous translations, Yukinori's choice of title draws on particular poems. Shimauchi, one of the few scholars to write about *Shizu no odamaki*, suggests the source is the following poem from *Ise monogatari*.⁸⁸

*Inishie no / shizu no odamaki / kurikaeshi / mukashi o ima ni / nasu yoshi mo ga na.*⁸⁹

As in times gone by
The weaver of hempen cloth
unwound her hand skein,
ah, that we might find a way
to turn those days back to now!⁹⁰

In this analogy, translation becomes a string of hemp being unwound, unravelling the present in order to return to the past. This is a new set of images for translation and does not suggest particular anxiety towards making a vernacular edition of *Genji* – the distinction is simply between past and present. Moreover, the implication is that Yukinori's hand skein is the very thing people have wished for to turn past into present and read *Genji*. This view is supported by another poem, this time from the *Kokinshū*, in which the expression *shizu no odamaki* appears:

*Inishie no shizu no odamaki iyashiki mo yoki mo sakari wa arishi mono nari.*⁹¹

The humble man too,
like the man of high estate,
Once enjoyed a prime
when he was brisk as a reel
wound for the striped cloth of old.⁹²

There is the same sense of time passing and a contrast between past and present as was seen in the previous poem, and indeed which was a feature of the poetic associations of the expression *shizu no odamaki*.⁹³ However, it is also noteworthy that the phrase *iyashiki mo yoki mo* ("the humble man too, like the man of high estate") appears in this second poem. Time, the great leveller, treats all people alike, and by extension Yukinori's vernacular translation levels the playing field so as to give readers beyond high-born circles a means to read *Genji*. Though it is only the title of the work, the expression *shizu no odamaki* may in fact be a polemical statement that, far from apologizing for rendering *Genji* in vernacular language for a low-born audience, as was the case with *Shibun ama*

no saezuri, claims to bring elite and non-elite readers to the same level. Whether or not these poetic references are intended is debatable, of course. However, it seems likely since the phrase *shizu no odamaki*, was a well-established poetic phrase and the source poems mentioned here come from two of the most important and widely-known works of poetry in Japanese history.

Conclusion

In order to understand the discursive attitudes of these translators it has been necessary to decode the literary references and imagery contained in the titles and prefaces to their works. Miyako no Nishiki and Masanobu put forward their texts as substitutions or intermediaries granting access to a desired original. Hanshichi was preoccupied with the gap between the language and readership of the source and that of his translation. Naomasa linked his text to the scholarly and technically accurate work of Norinaga, and Yukinori's title hints that he saw translation as a great leveller of past, present, lowborn and high. Indeed, it is possible to observe a change in attitudes from the eighteen through to the nineteenth century, as those who rendered *Genji* into various forms of vernacular language exhibited a growing confidence in their art and no longer had to hide behind self-deprecating titles and imagery.⁹⁴ The effect of Norinaga's *Kokinshū* translation was particularly important in this respect.

There is much work still to be done on these and other vernacular translations from the period. In addition to detailed comparative studies of the texts themselves, research on the terminology and metaphors used in the prefaces to other kinds of rewritings will also offer insights into possible overlaps or discontinuities with the type of texts grouped together here. Its contours yet to be fully revealed, vernacular translation offers tantalizing glimpses of new ways that scholars, and readers with lower levels of literacy alike engaged with classical Japanese texts during the Tokugawa period.

NOTE

¹ Fujita Tokutarō, *Genji monogatari kenkyū shomoku yōran*, Tokyo, Rokubunkan, 1932, p. 88. Subsequent studies focusing on *Genji* vernacularizations as a group have been bibliographic in nature. Some scholars have taken them into account in their analysis, but the phenomenon as a whole has been largely unstudied. On this topic and for a bibliography of the limited secondary literature, see Rebekah Clements, "Rewriting Murasaki: Vernacular Translation and the Reception of *Genji Monogatari* during the Tokugawa Period", *Monumenta Nipponica*, 68(1), 2013, pp. 1-36, especially p. 1, n. 2. Studies of individual translations, where relevant, are cited below.

² See for example Suzuki Ken'ichi, *Genji monogatari no hensōkyoku: Edo no shirabe*, Tokyo, Miyai Shoten, 2003; Emoto Hiroshi (ed.), *Edo jidai no Genji monogatari*, Tokyo, Ōfū, 2007 and Shirane Haruo (ed.), *Envisioning the Tale of Genji: Media, Gender, and Cultural Production*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2008 on *Genji*; Suzuki Ken'ichi, *Ise monogatari no Edo: koten imeiji no juyō to sōzō*, Tokyo, Shinwasha, 2001 on *Ise monogatari*; and Joshua Mostow, *Pictures of the Heart: The Hyakunin Isshu in Word and Image*, Honolulu, University of Hawai'i Press, 1996, pp. 23-136 on the reception of *Hyakunin isshu*. Suzuki Ken'ichi (*Edo kotengaku no ron*, Tokyo, Kyūko Shoin, 2011) considers the reception of "the classics" (*koten*) in general.

³ The need to consider metaphors deployed by theorists of translation in history has been argued by Translation Studies scholars such as James St André (ed.), *Thinking Through Translation with Metaphors*, Manchester, St Jerome Publishing, 2010.

⁴ *Kokinshū tōkagami* (A *Kokinshū* Telescope, completed 1793, printed 1797), discussed below.

⁵ Maria Tymoczko, "Reconceptualizing Translation Theory: Integrating Non-Western Thought about Translation", in Theo Hermans (ed.), *Translating Others*, vol. 1, Manchester, St Jerome Publishing, 2006, pp. 13-32.

⁶ Theo Hermans, "Introduction - Translation Studies and a New Paradigm", in Theo Hermans (ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature - Studies in Literary Translation*, London, Palgrave, 1985 p. 9; Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, London, Routledge, 2008; George Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, London, Oxford University Press, 1975.

⁷ John Milton, "Between the Cat and the Devil: Adaptation Studies and Translation Studies", *Journal of Adaptation in Film & Performance*, 2, 1, 2009, pp. 47-64; André Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London, Routledge, 1992.

⁸ Georges L. Bastin, "Adaptation", in Mona Baker, Gabriela Saldanha (eds.), *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London, Routledge, 2009, pp. 5-6.

⁹ James St André, "History", in Mona Baker, Gabriela Saldanha (eds.), *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation*, London, Routledge, 2009, pp. 135.

¹⁰ An example of a similar kind of translation is *volgarizzamento*, the practice of translating from Latin into Italian vernaculars during the twelfth through thirteenth centuries. See Alison Cornish, *Vernacular Translation in Dante's Italy: Illiterate Literature*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2011.

¹¹ See, eg, Clements, "Rewriting Murasaki", cit., pp.14-18 and 24-26.

¹² The juxtaposition between language de-

scribed as “ga” and language described as “zoku” may be seen in numerous dictionaries compiled during the period (Fukushima Kunimichi, “Gazokugo taiyaku jisho no hattatsu”, *Jissen joshi daigaku bungakubu kiyō*, 12, 1969, pp. 205-218; Yuasa, “Gazoku taiyaku jishorui no zokugo no seikaku”, cit.. On the various meanings of “vernacular” in English see Fiona Somerset and Nicholas Watson, “Preface: On ‘Vernacular’”, in Fiona Somerset, Nicholas Watson (eds.), *The Vulgar Tongue: Medieval and postmedieval vernacularity*, University Park, Pa., Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003, p. IX.

¹³ See for example *Genji kogagami* (A Little Mirror of the Tale of Genji, ca. 14th century), one of the most widely read and reprinted digests of the pre-modern period. The preface to the 1751 edition, one of the few editions to articulate the project in direct terms, describes it as “abbreviating the contents of the [source] chapters” (*maki-maki no kokoro o tsuzumeshirushi*) (Ii, *Genji monogatari chūshakusho kyōjushi jiten*, cit., p. 145). Likewise, the afterword to *Jūjō Genji* (A Tale of Genji in Ten Chapters, 1661), another major digest, says the author hoped that if he “wrote out extracts of various parts the result would be easy to read” (*tokorodokoro kakinuki haberaba meyasukaran to*) (reprinted in Ii, *Genji monogatari chūshakusho kyōjushi jiten*, cit., p. 397).

¹⁴ Shirane, *Envisioning the Tale of Genji*, cit., pp. 1-6 and 157-239.

¹⁵ Shimizu Fukuko, *Genji monogatari hanpon no kenkyū*, Osaka, Izumi Shoin, 2003.

¹⁶ Ozaki Satoakira, Noda Akira (eds.), *Genji tōkagami*, Tokyo, Benseisha, 1991, pp. 4-5; Kawamoto, “Kinsei zenki shōsetsu to *Genji monogatari*”, cit., pp. 136-142.

¹⁷ Peter F. Kornicki, “Unsuitable Books for Women?: *Genji Monogatari* and *Ise Monogatari* in Late Seventeenth-Century Japan”, *Monumenta Nipponica*, 60, 2, 2007, pp. 150-151;

Shirane, *Envisioning the Tale of Genji*, cit. Illustration is particularly noteworthy here as it can function as “intersemiotic translation”, that is to say, “an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems”. See Roman Jakobson, “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation”, in Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, London and New York, Routledge, 2000, pp. 139. On the pictorial translation of *Hyakunin isshu*, for example, see Mostow, *Pictures of the Heart*, cit., pp. 123-136.

¹⁸ On the reception of *Ise monogatari* see Suzuki, *Ise monogatari no Edo*, cit.; Yamamoto Tokurō, Joshua Mostow (eds.), *Ise monogatari sōzō to hen'yō*, Osaka, Izumi Shoin, 2010; on *Kokinshū*, Masuda Shigeo (ed.), *Kokinwakashū no dentō to hyōka*, Tokyo, Kazama Shobō, 2004; on *Hyakunin Isshu*, Mostow, *Pictures of the Heart*, cit., and Nagata Shin'ya (ed.), *Kinsei Hyakunin isshu zokugenkai no kenkyū*, Tokyo, Izumi Shoin, 2001.

¹⁹ *Ise monogatari hirakotoba* (Tales of Ise in Plain Language), reprinted in modern characters in Imanishi Yūichirō, *Tsūzoku Ise monogatari*, Tokyo, Heibonsha, 1991. See also Joshua Mostow, “Modern Renditions and Translations of Japanese Classical Poetry, with Special Reference to Tales of Ise”, in Ii Haruki (ed.), *Imēji toshite no “Nihon”: Nihon bungaku – hon'yaku no kanōsei/Imagined Japan: Japanese Literature – the Possibility of Translation*, Osaka, Osaka University Press, 2003, pp. 65-81 and Richard Bowring, “The *Ise monogatari*: A Short Cultural History”, *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 52, 2, 1992, pp. 401-480.

²⁰ *Kokinshū tōkagami* and *Kokinwakashū hinakotoba* (*Kokinshū* in Countrified Language, printed 1796). A transcription of *Kokinshū tōkagami* with commentary is contained in Ono Susumu, Ōkubo Tadashi (eds.), *Motoori Norinaga zenshū*, vol. 3, Tokyo, Chikuma Shobō, 1969, pp. 5-291. See also Thomas J. Harper, “Norinaga on the Translation of Waka: His Preface to A *Kokinshū Telescope*”,

in Thomas Hare, Robert Borgen, Sharalyn Orbaugh (eds.), *The Distant Isle: Studies and Translations of Japanese Literature in Honor of Robert H. Brower*, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan, 1996, pp. 205-230, which contains an English translation of Norinaga's preface. A facsimile and transcription of *Kokinwakashū hinakotoba* is available with commentary in Gotō Takeshi, *Kokin wakashū hinakotoba no kokugogakuteki kenkyū*, Tokyo, Musashino Shoin, 1989. There is a considerable scholarship on the controversy surrounding the alleged similarity of these two texts (Itō Masamitsu, “*Kokinshū tōkagami*, *Kokin wakashū hinakotoba* kan no hyōsetsu mondai ni tsuite”, *Kokugo kenkyū*, 45, 1982, pp. 55-71).

²¹ *Hyakunin isshū Ogura no yamabumi* (A Walk Through the Ogura *Hyakunin isshū* Mountain, 1803), *Hyakunin isshū mine no kakehashi* (A Ladder to the Peak of *Hyakunin isshū*, 1806) and *Hyakunin isshū azusa yumi* (A Catalpa Bow for the *Hyakunin isshū*, 1810). For a modern transcription of these texts with commentary see Nagata, *Kinsei Hyakunin isshu zokugenkai no kenkyū*, cit.

²² (An Elegant Tale of Genji, 6 vols). Available in facsimile and transcription: Kurakazu Masae, Saeki Takahiro (eds.), *Koten yatsushimono*, 3, *Ukiyo zōshi kenkyū shiryō zōsho*, Tokyo, Kuresu Shuppan, 2008; Miyako no Nishiki (Shishido Kōfū), *Fūryū Genji monogatari*, in Kokusho Kankōkai (ed.), *Kokusho kankōkai sōsho*, vol. 5, 1911, pp. 485-533.

²³ (A Young Sprout's Tale of Genji, 6 vols). There is no modern transcription of this text. A first edition woodblock print is available in the British Library (shelf mark: 16107 G.32). There is a transcription (not wholly accurate) of the two prefaces with discussion in Inoura Yoshifumi, “*Baiō Genji no shosaku Wakakusa Genji monogatari: futatsu no jobun o chūshin to suru kōsatsu*”, *Tōkyō daigaku kyōyō gakubu jinbun kagakuka kiyō*, 55, 1972, pp. 197-213.

²⁴ (A Fledgling's Tale of Genji, 6 vols). Unavailable either in transcription or facsimile reprint. A woodblock print edition (undated) is available from the Waseda University Library (shelf mark: 12 01010 1-10).

²⁵ (Autumn Leaf and Cherry Blossom Genji, 6 vols). For a transcription see Baiō (Okumura Masanobu), *Kōhaku Genji monogatari*, in Kokusho Kankōkai (ed.), *Kinsei bungei sōsho*, 7, Tokyo, Kokusho Kankōkai, 1911, pp. 228-268.

²⁶ (Vulgar/Vernacular Interpretation of The Tale of Genji, 6 vols). Unavailable either in transcription or facsimile edition. No first editions of the woodblock print appear to have survived but the National Diet Library holds a two woodblock prints of a 1721 edition, preface dated 1710 (shelf mark: 858-38 and 211-155). It is possible that the work was completed by 1710 but not printed until 1721. The text of *Zokuge Genji monogatari* is also included in a 1721 woodblock reprint of *Hinazuru Genji monogatari* also held by the Diet Library (shelf mark: 京-130). Fujita (*Genji monogatari kenkyūshomoku yōran*, cit., p. 89) lists *Zokuge Genji monogatari* as published in 1710.

²⁷ (Murasaki's Writings in the Gibberish of Fisherfolk, 72 vols). Available in a modern-character edition of the chapters covered in the woodblock print edition, and in microfilm copy of the manuscript. Taga Hanshichi, *Shibun ama no saezuri*, in Chinsho Kankōkai (ed.), *Chinsho Kankōkai Zōsho*, vol. 5, Tokyo, Chinsho Kankōkai, 1915.

²⁸ (A Vernacular Interpretation of the Moon on the Lake Commentary, 44 vols). The only known copy, a manuscript, is held in the Tōen Bunko collection of the Tōkai University Library (shelf mark: 桃-7-205). The Utsusemi-Wakamurasaki, Hatsune, Maki-bashira, and Wakana *jō/ge* chapters are missing, possibly lost. Ii (*Genji monogatari chūshakusho kyōjushi jiten*, cit., p. 357) suggests that *Kogetsushō genkai* is a transcription of

the original with interlineal commentary. However, Ikeda Kikan (*Genji monogatari jiten*, vol. 2, Tokyo, Tōkyōdō, 1960, p. 100) notes correctly that it is a vernacular translation with interlineal glosses.

²⁹ (A *Genji Telescope*, 2 vols). A facsimile copy of *Genji tōkagami* is contained in Ozaki and Noda (*Genji tōkagami*, cit.), though this work is now out of print.

³⁰ (A Hempen Hand Skein for the *Tale of Genji*, 40 vols). The only extant copies are two manuscripts in Yukinori's own hand, held by the Miyagi Prefectural Library. One, dated 1848, was probably a complete translation, from which volumes 32 and 33 have been lost (shelf mark: KM 930-シ4, K), and the other, a copy of the Kiritsubo chapter only (shelf mark: KM 930-ケ2, K) (National Institute for Japanese Literature, 2012).

³¹ (*The Tale of Genji* in Rustic Language, 1 vol). The only known copy, a manuscript draft, is held by the National Diet Library (shelf mark: 京乙-379).

³² Repetitions of identical or similar expressions within the same text are omitted.

³³ The compiler, Ozaki Masayoshi (*Gunsho ichiran* [1802], in Nagasawa Kikuya, Abe Ryūichi (eds.), *Nihon shomoku taisei*, vol. 1, Tokyo, Kyūko Shoin, 1979, p. 266), described it as "transferred and written in the vulgar language" (*zokugo ni utsushite kakeri*). Ozaki was the author of *Kokinshū hinakotoba*, discussed above.

³⁴ Motoori Norinaga, *Kokinshū tōkagami*, in Ōno Susumu, Ōkubo Tadashi (eds.), *Motoori Norinaga zenshū*, vol. 3, Tokyo, Chikuma Shobō, 1969 (orig. pub. in 1797), p. 5. Norinaga also described his work using the word *yaku*, which is the closest to a general word for "translation" in pre-modern Japan and was used for a variety of source/target language combinations including Dutch/Japan-

ese, and spoken vernacular Chinese/spoken Japanese. There is little work on translation in pre-modern Japan as a phenomenon, but an introductory overview is available in Judy Wakabayashi, "Translation in the East Asian Cultural Sphere: Shared Roots, Divergent Paths?", in Eva Hung, Judy Wakabayashi (eds.), *East Asian Translation Traditions*, Manchester, St Jerome, 2005, pp. 16-65.

³⁵ *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989². "Translate, v.", online version June 2012. (<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/204841>) (accessed 06 September 2012).

³⁶ *Shinpen shishi* is available in numerous first edition copies and a variety of reprints. In this article, I cite the Diet Library copy of the 1890 edition (shelf mark: 23-185): Masuda Yukinobu, *Shinpen shishi: ichimei tsūzoku Genji monogatari*, Tokyo, Seishidō, 1890, p. 7.

³⁷ This work is classified as a "vernacular translation" (*zokugo yaku*) in Ii's seminal work on *Genji* reception materials (*Genji monogatari chūshakusho kyōjushi jiten*, cit., p. 450), and a parody that goes beyond vernacular translation (Noguchi Takehiko, *Genji monogatari o Edo kara yomu*, Tokyo, Kōdansha, 1995, p. 217). While describing the work as a vernacular translation, Kawamoto ("Kinsei zenki shōsetsu to *Genji monogatari*", cit., pp. 130-131) notes that for Miyako no Nishiki it was also an experiment in writing a lengthier piece of fiction.

³⁸ Kawamoto, "Kinsei zenki shōsetsu to *Genji monogatari*", cit., pp. 130-135.

³⁹ Kurakazu, Saeki, *Koten yatsushimono*, 3, cit., p. 520. The word "light" (*hikari*) suggests *Genji*'s nickname "The Shining Prince" (*hikaru kimi*). Mt Ishiyama is a reference to the apocryphal story of Murasaki Shikibu receiving her inspiration for *Genji* after seeing the moon reflected on the waters of Lake Biwa while in retreat at the Ishiyama Temple. Whether Miyako no Nishiki's humility is genuine is debatable: convention dictated a

modest tone in prefatory remarks, and he was famously proud of his learning (Kamiya Katsuhiro, "Miyako no Nishiki no gakushiki to shuhō", *Kinsei Bungei*, 55, 1992, pp. 9-18). However, the sense of translation as a difficult and at times impudent act is a reoccurring theme in translation cultures worldwide, particularly in relation to canonical, scriptural or elite texts like *Genji*. Unless otherwise specified, translations are my own.

⁴⁰ Kurakazu, Saeki, *Koten yatsushimono*, 3, cit., p. 629. The transliteration is based on *furigana* in this edition. The expression *nezumi no hige* may be a reference to a type of brush used for delicate work that was made from mouse hair. The verb *sou* means variously to add to, to imitate or to compare (Nihon daijiten kankōkai (ed.), *Nihon kokugo daijiten*, Tokyo, Shōgakusan, 1976).

⁴¹ Royall Tyler (trans.), *The Tale of Genji*, New York, Penguin Books, 2003, p. 620.

⁴² *Ibid.* pp. 628-629, n. 9.

⁴³ Noguchi, *Genji monogatari o Edo kara yomu*, cit. p. 217.

⁴⁴ The preface to *Fūryū Genji* describes the scholars Fujiwara Shunzei (1114-1204) and his son Fujiwara Teika (1162-1241) as lovers who undo Murasaki Shikibu's clothing when reading the *Aobyōshi* ("Blue Cover") edition of *Genji* edited by Teika: "Shunzei and Teika, those old-time playboys, untied the purple string [i.e. undid the cord of Murasaki Shikibu's gown] and opened up the Blue Covers" (*Mukashi no koishiri Shunzei, Teika, Murasaki no hibo o toki aobyōshi o hiraite*). The expression *hibo/himo o toku* ("to undo the belt or cord") had long been associated with sexual intimacy in Japanese poetry [Kubota Jun, Baba Akiko (eds.), *Utakotoba utamakura daijiten*, Tokyo, Kadokawa Shoten, 1999, p. 746]. Elsewhere in his preface, Miyako no Nishiki's erotic imagery becomes still more obvious as he refers to "tasting/licking/sucking" Murasaki Shikibu (*Shikibu ga aji o namete*).

⁴⁵ Timon Screech, *Sex and the Floating World: Erotic Images in Japan, 1700-1820*, London, Reaktion, 1999, p. 243.

⁴⁶ Kornicki, "Unsuitable Books for Women?", cit., pp. 173-176.

⁴⁷ Kurakazu, Saeki, *Koten yatsushimono*, 3, cit., p. 517.

⁴⁸ This remark comes from the translator's preface to *Wakakusa Genji monogatari*. A (partially inaccurate) transcription exists of the two prefaces to *Wakakusa Genji* with discussion in Inoura. For ease of reference, I have cited Inoura's transcription where possible. This quote corresponds to Inoura, "Baiō Genji no shosaku Wakakusa Genji monogatari", cit., p. 207.

⁴⁹ Clements, "Rewriting Murasaki", cit., pp. 17-18.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁵¹ Inoura, "Baiō Genji no shosaku Wakakusa Genji monogatari", cit., p. 206.

⁵² For a discussion of this issue see Joshua Mostow, "Illustrated Classical Texts for Women in the Edo Period", in Peter F. Kornicki, Mara Patessio, Gaye G. Rowley (eds.), *The Female as Subject: Reading and Writing in Early Modern Japan*, Ann Arbor, Michigan University Press, 2010, pp. 65-72. On literacy and readership in early-modern Japan see Peter F. Kornicki, *The Book in Japan: A Cultural History from the Beginnings to the Nineteenth Century*, Leiden, Brill, 1998, pp. 30-38 and Richard Rubinger, *Popular Literacy in Early Modern Japan*, Honolulu, University of Hawai'i Press, 2007.

⁵³ Shibata Mitsuhiko, *Daisō zōsho mokuroku to kenkyū: kashihon'ya Ōnoya Sōbei kyūzō shomoku*, Musashimurayama, Seishōdō Shoten, 1983, p. 766.

⁵⁴ Inoura, "Baiō Genji no shosaku

Wakakusa Genji monogatari", cit., p. 204.

⁵⁵ A similar idea is expressed in the preface to *Kōhaku Genji monogatari*. This work is called *kōhaku* (lit. "red and white") because it covers the "Momiji no ga" (*Beneath the Autumn Leaves*) and the "Hana no en" (*Under the Cherry Blossoms*) chapters. However, the preface author adds a layer of meaning to *kōhaku* by suggesting it is a reference to the red and white clothing of a "seductive contemporary beauty [or courtesan]" (*shiomuku benimuku no iromekitaru tōfū no yone*), arguing that the source text has been "transferred well" (*yoku utsuru*) into the gaudy *shidashi* of such a woman (Baiō, *Kōhaku Genji monogatari*, cit., p. 228). *Shidashi* had a variety of meanings including novelty, costume, and acting style. On acting and cross-dressing as metaphors for translation, see Yotam Benshalom, "Performing Translation", in James St André (ed.), *Thinking Through Translation with Metaphors*, Manchester, St Jerome Publishing, 2010, pp. 47-71 and James St André, "Translation as Cross-identity Performance", in James St André (ed.), *Thinking Through Translation with Metaphors*, Manchester, St Jerome Publishing, 2010, pp. 275-294.

⁵⁶ Inoura, "Baiō Genji no shosaku Wakakusa Genji monogatari", cit., p. 204.

⁵⁷ Yanai Shigeshi et al. (eds.), *Genji monogatari*, 1, in *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei*, 19, Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1993, p. 182.

⁵⁸ Tyler, *The Tale of Genji*, cit., p. 100. For continuity I have altered Tyler's translation of *wakakusa* to "young sprouts".

⁵⁹ Kornicki, "Unsuitable Books for Women?", cit., pp. 180-181.

⁶⁰ Inoura, "Baiō Genji no shosaku Wakakusa Genji monogatari", cit., p. 211.

⁶¹ Taga, *Shibun ama no saezuri*, cit., p. 10.

⁶² Reprinted in *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁶³ Clements, "Rewriting Murasaki", cit., pp. 24-26.

⁶⁴ Hanshichi argued that including the source would have made the text too long (Taga, *Shibun ama no saezuri*, cit., p. 9). He does not specify what the source text is, though it bears similarities to the *Kogetsushō* (Clements, "Rewriting Murasaki", cit., p. 25).

⁶⁵ Ozaki, *Gunsho ichiran*, cit., p. 266.

⁶⁶ *Genji tōkagami*, discussed below. On Akira's interest in the relationship between vernacular and classical language see Yuasa, "Gazoku taiyaku jishorui no zokugo no seikaku", cit., pp. 151-179.

⁶⁷ Taga, *Shibun ama no saezuri*, cit., p. 4.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 3 and p. 5.

⁷⁰ Morohashi Tetsuji (ed.), *Daikanwa jiten*, vol. 10, Tokyo, Taishūkan Shoten, 1984, p. 42. The character used by Hanshichi also refers to the Dan people, a seafaring tribe of "barbarian" (ie non-Han) ethnicity in China.

⁷¹ Taga, *Shibun ama no saezuri*, cit., p. 1.

⁷² On *yamagatsu* see Kubota, Baba, *Utakotoba utamakura daijiten*, cit., p. 913.

⁷³ Kornicki, "Unsuitable Books for Women?", cit.; Gaye Rowley, "The Tale of Genji: Required Reading for Aristocratic Women", in Peter F. Kornicki, Mara Patessio, Gaye G. Rowley (eds.), *The Female as Subject: Reading and Writing in Early Modern Japan*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 2010, pp. 39-57.

⁷⁴ Taga, *Shibun ama no saezuri*, cit., p. 4.

⁷⁵ Eg. anxiety over vernacular Italian translations of Latin texts, known as *volgarizzamenti*. See Cornish, *Vernacular Translation in Dante's Italy*, cit., pp. 16-43, esp. p. 33.

⁷⁶ The preliminary remarks were not printed but a draft survives in Naomasa's notes and is reprinted in modern characters in Ozaki, *Genji tōkagami*, cit., pp. 4-5.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁷⁹ Motoori, *Kokinshū tōkagami*, cit., p. 5.

⁸⁰ Harper, "Norinaga on the Translation of Waka", cit., p. 209.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸² Information about the life of Yukinori is scarce and secondary materials contain some errors. *Kokusho sō mokuroku*, gives the pronunciation his name as Josoku (National Institute for Japanese Literature, 2012). For evidence of the correct reading (Yukinori) and details of his birth and family background see Satō Ken'ichi, "Sendai han'i Kuwahara shi kankei shiryō", in Miyagiken Toshokan Shiryō Hōshibu Chōsa Han (ed.), *Miyagiken Toshokan kichō shiryō senmon chōsa hōkokusho*, Sendai, Miyakigen Toshokan, 2009, pp. 28-34.

⁸³ An analysis of some aspects of Yukinori's translation methods is available in Shimauchi Keiji, "Honpō hatsu no Genji monogatari zokugoyaku", *Nihongogaku*, 29, 1, 2010, pp. 32-38.

⁸⁴ Miyagi Prefectural Library, shelf mark: KM 930-シ 4, K.

⁸⁵ The preface states that Yukinori made

the translation in "the leisure of my old age" (*rōgo no yokan*). Miyagi Prefectural Library, shelf mark: KM 930-シ 4, K, 1r.

⁸⁶ Kubota, Baba, *Utakotoba utamakura daijiten*, cit., p. 409.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 407-408. *Kokusho sō mokuroku* contains a number of other works with *shizu no odamaki* in the title, which may offer further insights into the use of this term. I have been unable to consult them.

⁸⁸ Shimauchi (2010, p. 30) incorrectly attributes this poem to both *Ise* and *Kokinshū*. It is only found in *Ise* (poem no. 65).

⁸⁹ Horiuchi Hideaki, Akiyama Ken (eds.), *Taketori monogatari, Ise monogatari*, in *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei*, 17, Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1997, p. 112.

⁹⁰ Joshua Mostow, Royall Tyler (eds.), *The Ise Stories: Ise monogatari*, Honolulu, University of Hawai'i Press, 2010, p. 85.

⁹¹ Kojima Noriyuki, Arai Eizō (eds.), *Kokinwakashū*, in *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei*, 5, Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1989, p. 268.

⁹² Helen Craig McCullough (ed.), *Kokin Wakashū: the First Imperial Anthology of Japanese Poetry*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1985, p. 195.

⁹³ Kubota, Baba, *Utakotoba utamakura daijiten*, cit., p. 409.

⁹⁴ Though some translators after Norinaga still chose to do so: see for example *Ese Genji* (A Fake Genji, 1892), available from the National Diet Library (shelf mark: YDM88954).

I would like to thank Gaye Rowley for her comments on a draft of this article.